

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed on March 30, 2007. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-30 are currently pending.

Request for Interview

The Applicant respectfully requests a telephonic interview with the Examiner after the Examiner has had an opportunity to consider this Amendment, but before the issuance of the next Office Action. The Applicant may be reached at 617-951-3067.

Allowable Subject Matter

At paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claims 15 and 20-23 were deemed allowable by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 101

At paragraphs 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner states that claim merely recites software per se.

Applicant respectfully urges that representative claim 10 is allowable under §101. The coredump function causes a physical transformation by the first server writing its memory to a storage device (disk). Data written to disk is a physical transformation.

Additionally, the coredump function in claim 10 falls under the useful, concrete, and tangible result exception. The coredump function writes memory to disk of the first

server as the first server is failing as a result of an error event. The writing to disk is a concrete and tangible result. The ability to access the memory in a core dump disk is a useful result.

Accordingly, as representative claim 10 falls under an exception for §101, in that it causes a physical transformation or performs a useful, concrete, and tangible result, claims 1-14 are believed in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 112

At paragraphs 4-11 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 10, 16, 24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the claims were rejected for insufficient antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended all antecedent basis errors except for paragraph 9. The term “attribute” is not part of claim 4. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 10, 16, 24, and 27 are believed allowable over the §112 rejection.

Claim Objections

At paragraphs 12-13 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 25 were objected to for informalities. Applicant has corrected the informalities, and believes claims 6 and 25 to be in condition for allowance.

All independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

All dependent claims are believed to be dependent from allowable independent claims.

Applicant respectfully solicits favorable action.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account
No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shannen C. Delaney/
Shannen C. Delaney
Reg. No. 51, 605
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500